

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2004

| PPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/068,283  | 02/05/2002  | Axel Scherer         | CIT.PAU.01          | 9733             |
| 7590 03/08/2004   |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Daniel L. Daw   | •-          |                      | MCDONALD, RC        | DDNEY GLENN      |
| MYERS, DAWES & ANDRAS LLP<br>19900 MacArthur Blvd, Ste 1150 |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| Irvine, CA 92   |             |                      | 1753                |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action   |  | Application No.                   | Applicant(s)                   |           |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
|   |  | 10/068,283                        | SCHERER ET AL.                 |           |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | Examiner                          | Art Unit                       |           |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | Rodney G. McDonald                | 1753                           |           |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this co   | mmunication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add              | ress      |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
|   | PERIOD FOR RE  | EPLY [check either a) or b)]      |                                | ٠         |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| (a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new   |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| (c) \( \times\) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.   |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.   |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.   |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 4,14 and 15 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit application in condition for allo  | The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.   |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| raised by the Examiner in the f   | The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)      will not be entered or b)      will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.   |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or   | will be) as follows  | <b>:</b>                          |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: 2,3 and 5-13.   | Claim(s) allowed: 2,3 and 5-13.  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1,4,14,15 and  | Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4,14,15 and 21-25</u> .  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 16-20  |  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
|   | □ □ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
|   | The second secon |                                   |                                |           |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |  |                                   | Thelian Mr.<br>Rodney G. McDor | Sout nald |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1753

## Application No.

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 110/068,283

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The limitation of having the plasma sputtering deposition disposed onto the elastomeric material was not considered in the finally rejected claims.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The restriction requirement has been overcome by cancellation of claims 16-20. The 35 U.S.C. 1st paragraph rejection to claims 1, 14 and 15 has been overcome. The 35 U.S.C. 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection of claim 4 has been overcome.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons set forth in the final rejection. The resist has some elasticity to it since it is a polymer even though Applicant argues it is a thermoset rigid material. With regard to claims 21-25 the 1st paragraph rejection will be maintained because Applicant has failed to show where in the specification the combination of directional etching and sputtering for masking is shown. The only statement Applicant makes is that directional etching is one focal point of the invention but it is not clear in showing the combination of the etching and sputtering steps..

Also the status indicator indicating "allowed" is not permitted when making the amendment.